

**From:** Harry Reisenleiter  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 1/18/02 9:16pm  
**Subject:** Microsoft Settlement

Sir or Madam:

After following the court case, appeal, and settlement process, I find it necessary to offer the following thoughts.

First, some background. Before entering the computer field fulltime, I spend 4 years earning my undergradutate degree and 4 years in the United States Air Force. I studied computers in college and in my time in the USAF.

I've been in the computer business since 1969, working through mainframes, midrange computers, desktops, laptops, palm tops, and hybrids. I've been fortunate to deal with innovative companies and with ethical companies. I've also had the misfortune of dealing with copy-cat companies and unethical companies. I've been on very successful projects providing customer-lead solutions in retail, wholesale, education, finance, manufacturing and now management services.

Many of my experiences with vendors have been pleasant, and many by necessity, have been with Microsoft.

I believe that the settlement under review at this time is grossly inadequate to address the unethical, monopolistic practices of Microsoft.

Microsoft's business practices (unethical pricing, contract manipulation, illegal bundling, hidden code) have driven many creative companies out of business. Do to their actions, there are no longer any real competitors in any software field Microsoft has chosen to enter.

Microsoft gained dominance by controlling the operating system and by bundling (and "dumping") software. Current pricing reflects the lack of competition. One example: When Word Perfect was a real competitor, Microsoft priced MS Word at \$99. Now, MS Word is more than twice that price. Similarly, when Lotus 1-2-3 was a real competitor (and, remember, ther was also QuatroPro), Microsoft "dumped" Excel, too. Then, after purchasing what became PowerPoint, Microsoft began bundling those three pieces of software for a price hardly higher than Word Perfect (or Lotus 1-2-3) alone.

Microsoft has distorted (lied) about "innovation", "great software", "customer focus", and "competition" throughout the trial and appeals process.

Let's take "innovation". Except for Windows OS and Excel (which was

originally written for Macintosh), Microsoft has not created any new software. They've purchased Word, PowerPoint, Internet Explorer, FrontPage and Outlook. They've only innovated in pricing and bundling; not real technological innovation.

Let's take "great software". Compare Palm's Desktop to Microsoft Outlook, specifically recurring meetings. In Palm, if you cancel an existing recurring meeting, the software presents 3 choices - "this one", "all future", and "all". Thus, meetings in the past will reflect history accurately. In Outlook, you are only given 2 choices - "all" or "this one". Past recurring meetings, then, are lost. This is not "great", but very poor design. Another Microsoft distortion.

In closing, I have but one request: please don't let this agreement stand. It is far too soft and will not change a thing as it currently is written.

Microsoft has earned, and continues to earn, punishment. And that punishment needs to be behavior altering, not a mere shaking of the finger.

Thank you,  
Harry Reisenleiter

-----